

REMARKS

Claims 1-4 and 7-28 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 19, 20, 27 and 28 have been amended as shown on pp. 2 and 5-7 of the Reply. Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-4 and 7-28 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-4 7-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrari *et al.*, (US Publication 2003/0097357) filed 10/16/2002 in view of Bailey *et al.*, (US Patent 6, 785,671). This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Ferrari, *et al.* either alone or in combination with Bailey, *et al.* does not teach or suggest every feature of the subject claims.

To reject claims in an application under § 103, an examiner must establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. A *prima facie* case of obviousness is established by a showing of three basic criteria. First, there must be some apparent reason to combine the known elements in the fashion claimed by the patent at issue (e.g., in the references themselves, interrelated teachings of multiple patents, the effects of demands known to the design community or present in the marketplace, or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art). To facilitate review, this analysis should be made explicit. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. ***Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.*** See MPEP § 706.02(j). See also *KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*, 550 U. S. ___, 04-1350, slip op. at 14 (2007). The reasonable expectation of success must be found in the prior art and not based on applicant's disclosure. See *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991) (emphasis added).

Applicants' subject matter relates to a system that enables interactive quality assessment of the items in a documentation set and allows for bulk remediation of common quality problems across groups of documents within the set. In particular,

independent claim 1 (and similarly 19, 20, 27 and 28), as amended, recites ***the bulk remediation includes at least one of modifying or updating content of the one or more items***. Ferrari, *et al.*, alone or in combination with Bailey, *et al.* does not teach or suggest this novel feature.

Ferrari, *et al.* relates to a system and method that employs rules to manipulate content presentation in a search and navigation system. In particular, a search interface allows the user to enter queries that are employed to classify documents. The system manipulates content presentation based on information about a user's query and a current navigation state by employing rules specified by a rules engine and can include documents that may not be in the set of documents specified by the present navigation state or can provide options to navigate to a new navigation state based on a rule or plurality of rules activated by the query. Furthermore, the system can also filter or sort documents in the navigation state based on the rule or plurality of rules activated by the query. (*See* page 6 and 7, [0083]-[0084]). However, Ferrari, *et al.* does not teach or suggest a system that can edit, update or modify the contents of a document and/or all instances across a set of documents.

Applicants' subject matter relates to a system and method to facilitate automated and interactive quality controls that are automatically applied to a technical documentation. A filter can have a predetermined threshold set up such that scores below the threshold can indicate corrective actions that can be distributed in or applied to the documentation set. For example, it may be statistically determined that introductory subject matter is much more likely to be accessed and scrutinized by respective users of the documentation. Thus, commentary received regarding introductory type topics or subject matter can be analyzed and applied in a uniform manner across other items in the set (*e.g.*, add introductory paragraph to pseudo code examples) that also may have topics associated with this type subject matter. (*See* page 8, lines 9-21.) As another example, if it is determined that explanatory topics are generally rated or scored as not supplying enough examples, then it may be determined to add more examples to other explanatory items in the documentation set even if the respective items had no corresponding data that indicated such deficiency. (*See* page 14, lines 10-13.) Thus, the disclosed system teaches bulk remediation of a quality problem across items in a documentation set wherein the

remediation includes modification of the content of the items. For example, it can be determined that an item includes ambiguous, imprecise, or unclear wording, a broken hyperlink, a bug reported in a technology, an undetermined problem, a code portion not working, a feature request, a useful topic, incorrect information, legacy documentation that had not been updated, poorly organized information, previously resolved issue, spelling error, not enough information provided for a topic. Furthermore, a need for a code example in a subsequent programming language, a need for an associated link, a need for a code example, *etc.* can be determined. The disclosed system performs corrective actions to correct the aforementioned problems in an item as well as in the remaining items in the documentation set. Ferrari, *et al.* is silent with regard to application of corrective action including modification of content, determined in an item, to disparate items across the documentation set.

Bailey, *et al.* relates to a system and method that facilitates viewing search results that span multiple item categories, and locates web pages that include offerings for products and other type of items. Bailey, *et al.* does not disclose quality assessment of items in a document set that includes indication of technical accuracy of the item and the ranking of items is not based on accuracy of items. Furthermore, Bailey, *et al.* does not teach or suggest a system or method that facilitates application of corrective action including modification of content, determined in an item, to disparate items across the documentation set and thus fails to cure the aforementioned deficiencies presented by Ferrari, *et al.* with respect to the subject claims.

In view of the foregoing, it is clear that neither Ferrari, *et al.* nor Bailey, *et al.*, either alone or in combination, teaches each and every aspect of independent claims 1, 19, 20 and 27-28 (and claims 2-18 and 21-26 that depend there from), and thus fails to make obvious the subject claims. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP492US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/

Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731